REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the

following discussion, is respectfully requested.

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-18 are pending.

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-18 are amended without the introduction of new matter.

II. Request for Priority under 35 U.S.C. §119

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge the claim for foreign

priority under 35 U.S.C. §119 for Japanese Patent Application Nos. 2002-209330 and 2003-

134906, filed on July 18, 2002 and May 13, 2003, respectively. Note that a Request for Priority

under 35 U.S.C. §119 was filed on May 28, 2002, and the Application Data Sheet lists the

foreign priority information.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 9, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

Accordingly, the claims are amended to overcome those rejections. However, if the Examiner

disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that mutually agreeable claim

language may be identified.

 $\{W: \label{eq:weighted} \begin{tabular}{ll} $\{W: \label{eq:weigh$

-7-

Application No. 10/623,178 Docket No.: 09496/000M861-US0

Amendment dated May 26, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 21, 2006

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Maynard

(U.S. Patent No. 5,385,539). Applicants respectfully traverse that rejection.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a hematocrit sensor that includes a sensor. Claim 1 as

currently written recites that the sensor includes, among other features, "a light emission device

and a single light reception device provided with said housing" (emphasis added). Support for

such recitation is found in the Specification at page 18, line 8 through page 19, line 12, and Figs.

5 and 6.

The outstanding Office Action asserts that Maynard discloses all of the limitations recited

in claim 1 of the present application. However, what Maynard describes is a hematocrit

measurement sensor that requires two light detecting devices.

More specifically, Maynard describes at column 3, lines 39-51 as follows.

The presently preferred embodiment is a hematocrit measurement sensor comprising a light emitting device for emitting light into a blood

sample and two light detecting devices for detecting the light emitted into the blood sample. The light emitting and light detecting devices are arranged in a predetermined geometric pattern such that light traveling

arranged in a predetermined geometric pattern such that light traveling from the light emitting device must travel further to reach one light detecting device than to reach the other light detecting device, thereby

forming a light path from the light emitting device to one light detecting device which is longer than the light path from the light emitting device to

the other light detecting device. (emphases added)

Maynard further describes at column 7, lines 49-52, referring to Fig. 5, that "[t]he light detecting

means are illustrated in FIG. 4 [sic] as a short path diode 32 and a long path diode 34. Again, the

path to diode 34 is longer than the path to diode 32."

 $\{W: \09496\000M861000\00750860.DOC \$

- 8 -

Application No. 10/623,178 Docket No.: 09496/000M861-US0

Amendment dated May 26, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 21, 2006

Maynard does not disclose or suggest a hematocrit sensor with a sensor including a light

emission device and a single light reception device provided with the housing, as recited in

claim 1.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 dependent therefrom are

patentably distinguishable over Maynard. Amended claim 14 and claims 15-18 dependent

therefrom are also patentably distinguishable at least for the above reasons advanced for

amended claim 1 to the extent that amended claim 14 includes features substantially similar to

amended claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6

and 14-18 based on Maynard.

V. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Maynard

in view of the Examiner's statement of ordinary skill. Further, claims 7-11 were rejected under

35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Maynard in view of Burbank et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,582,385, herein "Burbank").

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7-13 are allowable at least for the above

reasons advanced for independent claim 1 from which they depend. In addition, claims 7-13 are

allowable because Maynard teaches away from using a single light reception device. See

Maynard, column 3, lines 39-51. Further, claims 7-11 are allowable because Burbank does not

supplement the deficiency in Maynard. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the

- 9 -

Docket No.: 09496/000M861-US0

Application No. 10/623,178 Amendment dated May 26, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 21, 2006

withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of claims 12 and 13, and 7-11 based on Maynard, and

Maynard in view of Burbank, respectively.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments, Applicants believe the pending application is in

condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this

application to issue.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone

number indicated below once he has reviewed the proposed amendment if the Examiner believes

any issue can be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's

Amendment.

Dated: May 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroyuki Yasuda

Registration No.: 55,751

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant